DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 257 EA 009 976

AUTHOR Mitroff, Donna D.; Boston, Margaret E.
TITLE Program Residuals, or Did They Throw Out the Baby with the Bath?
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, N.Y., April 4-8, 1977); Attachments B and C may not reproduce clearly due to small print size

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Classroom Environment; *Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Education; *Individualized Instruction; *Instructional Innovation; Instructional Materials; Models; Questionnaires; Student Records; Teacher Aides; *Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

The effects are examined of an innovative experience on the classroom practices of teachers who have implemented an individualized instructional model in an externally supported program and are currently teaching in regular public school classrooms where the model is not supported. Data were collected through interviews, observations, and questionnaires to study the patterns and practices that the teachers have retained from one setting and transferred to the current setting. Data were analyzed in terms of the process of educational change. Implications of the findings for research and development, innovative practices, and implementation are discussed. (Author/MLF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144257

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donna D. Mitroff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROGRAM RESIDUALS

or

Did They Throw Out the Baby with the Bath?

by

Donna D. Mitroff and Margaret E. Boston

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, N.Y. April, 1977.

EA 009 976

In 1969, the large urban school system with which this study is concerned implemented two different innovative instructional models under Title I of ESEA in selected target area schools in the city. One of the models was developed locally by a staff of school district personnel specifically appointed to that task. The other was developed by the Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC) at the University of Pittsburgh. Both models were implemented one grade level at a time each year until they spanned grades K-3. During this time period the classroom teachers were receiving support for their efforts in the way of materials, training, and classroom aides.

In the Spring of 1975, the school district underwent a re-examination and reinterpretation of the ESEA, Title I guidelines.[1] The nature of the reinterpretation led to revisions in the manner in which Title I programs were to be implemented. The essence of the revisions was that neither of the two innovative models could be used by the regular teacher in a self-contained classroom. The 1975-76 school year was a transition year in

---

[1]In fact, the district was experiencing the problems with the Title 1 "rules of the game" described by McLaughlin. Faced with the prospect of being judged "noncompliant" by the SEA and losing the funding altogether or worse yet being fined, the district administrators drew up a set of procedures in which they tried to follow Title 1 guidelines to the letter. Like other districts during this new move for accountability they may have reacted by over-interpreting the guidelines. See Milbrey W. McLaughlin, "Implementation of ESEA Title I: A Problem of Compliance." Teacher's College Record, Vol. 77, No. 77, 1976. pp. 397-415.

which the two models were designated as "supplementary " to the basic mainstream program and available only to Title I eligible children. Then, in the Spring of 1976, a new and different Title I Program was designed which affected all system wide Title I programs and resulted in the elimination of both the local model, and the center model as budget items in the Title I contract.

The study[2]

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact that the experience with the implementation of the innovative instructional models had on the school environment. The specific focus of the study is on those classroom teachers who were trained in and taught in the innovative models and who are currently teaching in settings where there is no support for and no mandate to continue to use the innovative practices.

The study asks which, if any, aspects of the innovative models the teachers have retained and transferred to their current teaching situations? We have termed this phenomenon the "residuals" of an innovation. In this context residuals mean the patterns, (e. g., instructional strategies, management techniques, general principles, curriculum components, professional development) from the innovative model which teachers retain when program support is withdrawn.

---

[2]The authors greatly appreciate the assistance of Linda Matasic and the entire LRDC Field Services staff.

The larger context of the study is, of course, school change, and the issue is whether or not a systematic program implementation has any sustaining impact on the school environment. Most studies of school change, and indeed of change in general stop short of this important area. Those few studies which describe a return to site to determine what remains of an innovative experience stop with an examination of the district level adoption patterns (Carlson, 1972). If the innovation does not show as an item on the budget, the conclusion is drawn that the innovation is no longer present and the change in the system has not occurred. Our position is that adoption rate studies are only a small part of the problem. We contend that it is the individual teacher who is the actual consumer--the ultimate user of the innovation and as such, research needs to take the teacher as the unit of analysis for such instructional innovation follow-up studies. Treating the teacher as the unit of analysis is one of the ways in which we are measuring program impact on school change.

Method

The approach to this study is descriptive field research. Data were collected in a series of three successive rounds via 1.) a survey form, 2.) a questionnaire and 3.) personal interviews. With each round as more intensive information was collected, the size of the sample was reduced. The nature of the information collected in each round was based in part on analysis of data from the preceding round. This procedure enabled us to focus on some of the emergent themes in greater detail. A fourth round of data collection is planned. It will consist of classroom observations, but at this writing, the fourth round has not begun.

Subjects. The subjects for this study were those teachers and/or team leaders[3] in the Center model classrooms and local model classrooms, who were still on the rosters in the schools involved as of June, 1976. Although in the Fall of 1976 some of these teachers were working in different schools and/or in different capacities, they were included in the mailing of the first survey. This study was not, however, a follow-up of all teachers who had ever taught in the models.

Procedures. The Survey Form (See Attachment A) was sent out in late Fall to a total of 158 teachers. The purpose of this survey was to enlist the cooperation of the teachers in the study and to collect demographic data. This survey form yielded an extremely high rate of return (N=125), 79.1%, with a slightly higher rate coming from the local model group (82.3%) than from the Center model group (67.6%). In addition to the quantity of returns, numerous teachers indicated, by adding notes on the form, their interest in the study and their willingness to participate further.

In round two, a Questionnaire (See Attachment B), prepared jointly by local district and LRDC staff members and organized so that the same form would represent both models, was mailed to the 125 subjects who had returned

---

[3]Team Leader is the name given to a role which was created by this district's Title I program. Team Leaders had no classroom assignment. They were assigned to one school with the specific responsibility of assisting in the implementation and maintenance of the innovative models through training teachers and developing and managing materials. When program support was withdrawn, the role was abolished and the incumbents took other positions, many of them in classrooms.

the survey from. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain a broad base of data on model components and their continued use or disuse, along with teachers' thoughts via open-ended questions.

A framework was devised for selecting a sample for personal interviews in round three. The intent of the framework was to assure a representative distribution from both innovative models in both public and parochial school settings and across the grade levels involved. Similarly, team leaders were selected from both models to assure representativeness. Once the numbers in each cell were determined, a stratified random sample of 30 teachers was selected on two variables, number of years teaching in the model and number of years in teaching.

The interview from (see Attachment C) was designed to gather information that would clarify, verify, or extend the information obtained through the questionnaire. To date, twenty-one of the 30 personal interviews have been completed by the LRDC Field Services Staff.

Results

The results obtained from the round two questionnaire were analyzed first by total group response and then by model to model response (i.e. the local model group to the Center model group).

Analysis of total group responses: Table 1 provides information about component categories. The sub-sets under each category were collapsed to obtain a general category rating (refer to Attachment B).

Table 1 shows that the majority of the teachers report that after a year and a half without program support they are either continuing to use the components of their models as they did with program support, or they are continuing to use them but have made adaptations for the current situations. The one component which appears to show a larger rejection by teachers is the record keeping component. A re-examination of the subset data shows that Teacher Kept Records are mostly continued or adapted, whereas the Child Kept Records--individual and group--are no longer maintained. For some reason teachers are less enthusiastic about the continuance of this component when there is no requirement for it.

Table 1

Teacher Response to the Extent of Program Component Use

Component	Continued to use as I did with Title I support.	Adapted this to my current situation, but do continue to use it.	Chose not to use in my present classroom.	Have tried to use but couldn't.	Would like to use but need more time.	Would like to use but need assistance.	Would like to use but need materials.	Total
Classroom Management	45%	42%	3%	3%	2%	3%	1%	99%
Curriculum Materials	44%	43%	0%	6%	3%	2%	7%	99.6%
Record Keeping	25%	40%	22%	2%	4%	5%	1%	99%
Techniques for Individualization	30%	62%	1%	1%	4%	2%	0%	99%
Specific Teaching Methods	32%	48%	3%	2%	8%	6%	1%	100%

Another important component of the innovative programs was the provision for professional growth. Analysis of the responses of the teachers to their experiences with the five facilitators of professional growth produced the following ordering from most valuable to least valuable: (1) regularly scheduled all-day workshops, (2) local model workshop staff or Center consultant staff, (3) team leader support, (4) summer workshops, (5) supervisory instructional specialist.[4] These results are reported here, although some ambiguity is present as to the interpretation of each facilitating category, and to the identification of specific people who function in the roles of 2, 3, and 5. In spite of the ambiguities, there was no question about the supercedence of regularly scheduled all-day workshops, an on-going in-service means of professional growth, over other categories. Over 50% of the respondents indicated this category as being "most useful".

The responses to the open-ended questions were examined for themes. Responses relating to the first question (What aspect, if any, of your Title 1 program do you miss the most?) were fairly easy to categorize as similar ideas came up again and again. One frequently mentioned category dealt with resources for professional growth. Under this category we have included such topics as workshops, the opportunity to observe and exchange ideas with other teachers, support and assistance from a team leader, and the opportunity to work with professional personnel or specialists.

---

[4]This is the district's title for the traditional supervisor's role.

The comments were, in fact, additional corroboration of the usefulness of the "facilitators" of professional growth from the preceding question.

Another "most missed" feature was the classroom aide. A comment frequently added to the statement about loss of aides was that it was the loss of the "teacher/aide team" which was the important factor. One teacher wrote "When the aides were assigned to a specific room they knew the children and the procedures and were an important part of the team." Also mentioned was the fact that the aides were well trained, that their contribution was "much more than doing clerical work."

Materials were mentioned as being missed by several teachers, but not so often as one would expect from a program which provided teachers with a great deal more than they now get. This may be due to the fact that the program support has only been withdraw for one year and materials are still available. Indeed, teachers had just indicated in part one of the questionnaire that they continue to use components of the program. The question will be an interesting one to ask in another year when supplies have begun to run out.

The second question (What aspects are you most happy to have eliminated?) had one answer that received a heavy response: "None--everything was great". Another topic mentioned frequently though was "paperwork". In most cases, it was specified that the referent was to additional or unnecessary forms, check lists, inventories, etc., that were required for the program and in other cases the referent was to the additional records that had to be kept on children. Even though the general category of paperwork drew negative reactions, some

interesting comments were added which supported the notion that it was a "necessary evil". For example: "....the bookkeeping, though time consuming and tedious at times, was very good. It gave me a good idea of where the kids were and where to take them".

While some teachers (the higher number) regretted the loss of the team leaders, a few were happy to see them eliminated. When this was the case, it was because the specific person was felt to be ineffective. There were also a few negative reactions to workshops. Again however, specific qualifications were added such as: "they became repititious," "after seven years my time could have been better spent in the classroom," and "teachers should have had more input."

In response to the third question's invitation to comment on anything, the majority of the teachers addressed the subject of general program issues. That is, the comments were related to the overall management of the Title I effort rather than to the specific model in which they taught. Such topics as program regulations, eligibility requirements, the need for more information to teachers on how decisions get made and why, a feeling of getting caught between the forces of the new model and the existing practices, and the short duration of "new programs" are included here.

On the eligibility requirements issue teachers expressed discomfort with the Title I program's "discrimination against non-eligible children" -- "you should declare the entire classroom eligible if a certain percent meet the requirements" and "eligibility requirements deny the use of materials and equipment to ineligible students." On the "duration" issue one teacher

wrote "I would like to see a program that lasts more than a few years. In eleven years, I have taught four reading series without leaving the district, school or grade level." Another wrote, "It would be beneficial to me if a program would not be eliminated from the schools as quickly as they have been. One just starts to feel comfortable in a program and the following year it is eliminated."

A number of teachers expressed a vote of confidence for the experience of teaching in an innovative situation in the sense that they acknowledged that they were changed by the experience, that they will "never go back to my old way of teaching." Another expressed a new appreciation for "how long it takes to learn and to change."

Analysis of responses by model: An examination of the data from the questionnaire by model shows that there are only a few notable differences between the responses of the local model teachers and the responses of the Center model teachers concerning program components. For example, the Center model teachers are more inclined to adapt the Classroom Management component whereas the local model teachers continue to use the component as they did when they had the program support.

Both groups spread out across more options under the use of the Specific Teaching Methods component than in other components. However, the majority of the Center model teachers are adapting the Specific Teaching Method while the local model teachers are using the methods the same (36%), adapting (44%), and asking for more help and more time (8.6% and 6%).

Both groups responded similarly to the component of Record Keeping. More specifically, the sub-items of "child-kept" and "group-kept records" are being questioned by the teachers in both programs, but the teacher-kept records are being maintained.

More interesting differences between programs emerge from a re-analysis of the open-ended questions. While both groups expressed their greatest loss in terms of "support for professional growth" and the loss of the "classroom aide" there are differences concerning the next "most missed" item. The local model teachers feel the loss of the "critical mass" phenomenon most keenly, such as the opportunity to interact with other teachers on an informal basis, and to share ideas in the workshop sessions. The Center model teachers, on the other hand, stress the loss of materials and add some specific reasons for missing materials which have to do with the individualized and individualizing aspects of the materials. This is no surprise because of the nature of the differences in the programs. The two programs are somewhat similar in that they emphasize the individualization of instruction and through individualization the creation of child-centered, active learning environments in classrooms. The principle difference appears to be that the Center model stresses the use of instructional techniques, curriculum materials, and classroom procedures which are specified as part of the overall instructional innovation, while the local model stresses the training of classroom teachers in the principles and techniques of individualized instruction and the "open classroom" concept so that teachers can create the desired changes in their classrooms.

Among the responses of the Center model group, there was greater specificity of the particular aspects of the individualized curriculum which

teachers miss most. For example, "The math curriculum....I miss the sequencing and ease of individualization." And another, "The individualization aspect of the program was great. It allowed children the freedom to do more work at their own level." And "The availability of materials to reach each child."

In general, both groups of teachers expressed favorable attitudes toward their particular program: "Sorry that (Center curricula) were discontinued," the program is "so much superior to traditional....it is a sad state to have it disappear. I am doing it illegally this year and hope I will be able to in the future....I swear by individualization," and another "The (Local Model) experience is so great, kids don't want to go home."

Personal Interviews

A preliminary analysis of the round three personal interviews supports the findings determined by the questionnaire in regard to model components which are continued as before or with adaptations. The teachers maintain the physical room arrangement with various learning centers, content areas, or independent work stations. They still make use of materials and equipment provided by the former Title I programs. Those teachers who still have a classroom aide for a portion of time appreciate the aides and make use of aide time for operating the model. In other words, the teachers will allot that part of the day when the aide is available as the time when they operate the innovative model. The teachers report the use of the diagnostic/prescriptive process, aspects of the record keeping system, and the classroom management system.

Program effects on teacher attitude toward the way children learn and the techniques and skills learned for reaching individual children do persist. However, some teachers were quick to report that to a certain extent they are unchanged by the experience since "I always thought of myself as a humanized teacher," and "I never was a traditional teacher with everyone doing the same thing." Most teachers however, reflect a change which can perhaps be best summarized by the statements: "The program had a big impact on my philosophy. Prior to (Local model) there had been no emphasis on the individual child." And ". . . I can allow more pleasurable learning . . . more freedom for teachers and students."

Teachers again expressed a strong need for opportunities for professional growth. The value of in-service workshops and exposure to the professional staff was reiterated through statements such as: "I'm stagnant now, . . . visits from the resource people and other teachers were reinforcing."

In regard to conditions that support or inhibit the continued use of program aspects, the teachers identified such things as the presence (or absence) of materials and equipment, the full-time trained aide (no aide), time (no time) to know the problems of specific kids and deal with them, the principal's support, other teacher's support: "the program is easier to operate if other teachers know it," and the children's reaction: "seeing children make progress is a good support."

One salient theme that emerged from the interviews is the awareness of teachers of the frequent lack of clear definition of support roles, and the conflict that sometimes occurred within and between the various roles, both those created by the program and those existing within the school system.

The effect of clear role definition (or lack of definition), the absence (or presence) of conflict of roles can support or inhibit program operation or continuation by the teachers.

It is interesting to note some of the factors that teachers think contribute to the principal's support of programs: "If they trust the teacher's ability and think the program is educationally sound," "If other teachers support and use the program," "If you show success--if they know the program is helping kids," and "If the word is out that use of the program is okay from upper administration."

The topic of adaptations was of particular interest to us. Since the first questionnaire indicated a high rate of adaptation of model components, we hoped to probe this area in the interviews for examples of actual adaptations which teachers have made. This was more difficult than we anticipated. The teachers were generally not able to give the type of specificity for which we were searching. In some sense this is consistent with one of the main notions about adaptations: namely that adaptations are necessary to create local ownership (Rand study, 1975, McLaughlin). In our case it may be that local ownership was complete to the point that teachers did not know they had adapted from something else.

Nevertheless we did obtain some examples of adaptations. In Table 2 we have indicated an example of the type of adaptations that are being made for each of the five model components.

Table 2

Examples of Types of Adaptations made to Model Components

Model components	Example of adaptations made by teachers in transferring component aspect to current teaching situation.
1. Classroom management	Because of loss of aide, teacher operates individualized model fewer days (3) than during program support. Activity cards (used by children who visit learning centers) now recorded on tape to compensate for loss of aide.
2. Curriculum materials	Games developed for innovative model curriculum were re-made using content from mainstream curriculum. An early learning skills curriculum has been coordinated into the basal reading series.
3. Record Keeping	The formats for the following record forms have been re-made for use with mainstream curricula: weekly chart, reading log, master sheet.
4. Techniques for individualization	Teacher rewrote pre-post tests for the basal reading series.
5. Specific teaching methods	Teacher added a unit to basal reading curriculum to build pre-requisite behaviors. Teacher used a beginning reading strategy for teaching blending with the letter/sound sequence of the basal series. Teacher makes teaching tapes (used extensively in innovative model) because "they teach kids to listen."

Discussion

One conclusion which can be drawn from the data collection in this study is that one year after the withdrawal of support of two innovative classroom programs, teachers report that they are continuing to use the majority of the components either as they did with program support or with adaptations to their current situation. Our original proposition, that withdrawal of an innovation from the budget line is not equal to withdrawal of the innovation at the user level, is at least superficially confirmed. As an example, the overall data indicate that although teachers object to "meaningless paperwork," teacher kept records of pupil progress are valued and still used; that is teachers have continued to use the record keeping system from the former programs intact or else have made adaptations appropriate to their situation, since record keeping taught a "method to know children" and made one "much more aware of the importance of keeping data on kids."

Our limited findings on the nature of the adaptations being made seem to indicate that a combination of both simple and complex aspects of the components are being adapted. For instance re-making record forms with different content is fairly simple but designing and adding a unit to develop pre-requisite reading skills is fairly complex. We need to ask which teachers are performing which types of adaptations? Does years of experience with the innovation relate to the type of adaptation the teacher is capable of effecting?

In our preliminary data analysis by grade level we find a greater tendency for kindergarten teachers to be "retainers" while third grade

teachers are the ones who "chose not to use" or select the wider range of options on the questionnaire. While this tendency may say something about the differences between kindergarten and third grade teachers, or the difference in kindergarten and third grade programs, we need to consider the possibility that this characteristic is related to the implementation plan for the two models. By design, the models were implemented in a grade at a time from kindergarten through third grade. The effect of this plan is that kindergarten teachers are in the model longer than other grade level teachers and may have become more capable both in implementing the model components and/or adapting them. Put another way, this group may have progressed further through the "Levels of Use" described by Hall (1973). The more experienced teachers may have moved into the levels described as refinement and integration.

The Levels of Use/Stages of Concern theory (Fuller, 1969; Hall, 1973) also has interesting implications for model to model differences. As a group the teachers from the Center model include more expressions on the impact of the program on students, while the local model teachers express a greater concern for the loss of program aspects which are more directly a benefit to the teacher while indirectly a benefit to the children, i.e., the "critical mass" phenomenon, workshops and interactions with peers from which they learn new techniques. The content of the comments indicate a much greater personal loyality to the innovation

experience by the local model teachers. This is a positive and necessary aspect of any planned change effort. But the question is: Is this group, because of the nature of the program which they have been a part of or the process by which they were trained, more "stalled" at the level of "personal concerns?" Does the implementation of a more structured, more developed program lead more readily to impact concerns by teachers? Is "less personal loyalty" a real outcome of implementing a highly structured, non-locally developed classroom program? Can the two efforts be combined in some way, i.e., could the structured program be implemented under the locally determined process?

Results of this study suggest some policy implications for Federal programs such as Title I: the most notable concerns eligibility requirements. It seems that the guidelines for determining and fulfilling eligibility requirements can usually be complied with at the abstract or higher administrative level, (e.g., Those children who fall below a certain stanine on a standardized test are designated as eligible children). But can the guidelines be implemented at the classroom level? At a personal level, teachers report having difficulty separating or isolating children on the basis of eligiblity. They wish to provide an instructional program for "all" of the children. So we might question if the single "eligible" child should be the target of federally funded programs or would the purposes of the funding be better served if the target were the eligible classroom, school unit (e.g., primary grades), or the total school?

A second implication for policy is the intensity with which our subjects expressed the need and desire for professional growth opportunities. The desire on the part of the teachers to break down the "aloneness of teachers" (Sarason, 1971) is as strong as the ability of researchers to describe it. Teachers not only want to meet and exchange professional ideas with their peers and with specialists, they also want the team effort as represented by the teacher/aide unit. One possible implication of this is that a phase-out of monetary support might allow for continuation of the resources for professional growth beyond the termination of monies for further development and materials. Such a phase might assure the continuation of desirable behaviors learned from the experience with an innovation. The real concern of the phase-out plan is, after all, for keeping the system dynamic; in that sense a phase-out plan should have a different emphasis from that which has brought the teachers to the point where they are committed to retaining their new skills.

Finally, we have asked ourselves where we need to go from here. One of the purposes of descriptive studies is to map an area and point out questions for more intensive study. To begin with we want to continue to investigate the nature of the adaptations which are being made. Our subjects say they have adapted. Other research studies have cited the importance of adaptation as a critical phase of the user (Rand 1975). We need more investigation of the area of adaptations: What are they? What aspects of

the model are adaptable? How do teachers go about the process? Are they creating adaptations or mutations? Mapping the nature of adaptations will be one focus of our classroom visits.

We need also to attempt to find out who the non-respondents are. It may be that they are the rejectors. If so, their attitudes and behaviors are obviously of equal interest and importance. We must attempt to recycle through the original subject pool and find out more about the non-respondents.

Conclusion

And so the findings of this study enable us to say that: They did not throw out the baby with the bath --- at least not yet! The study indicates that the experience of implementing the innovative instructional models had a sustaining impact on this group of teachers. The implications of the findings are particularly important at this time of declining Federal support for the development of new programs. It is critical for program developers to begin to assess the changes that their clients, the teachers, have internalized so that when monies for program support are withdrawn the possibility still exists that aspects of the innovation will continue to be part of the teacher's repetoire. Such information could assist educators in designing better implementation strategies -- strategies which take into account that inevitable time when support will be withdrawn.

References

Carlson, R. O. School Superintendents: Careers and Performance, Columbus, Ohio; Merril, 1972.

Fuller, F. F. Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, March 1969, 6 (2), 207-226.

Hall, G. E., Wallace, R. C., & Dossett, W. F. A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1973.

McLaughlin, M. W. "Implementation of ESEA Title I: A Problem of Compliance," Teacher's College Record, 1976, 77 (77), 397-415.

McLaughlin, M. W. "Innovations in Classroom Organization," Paper presented at American Education Reseach Associate Annual Meeting, March 31, 1975, Washington, D.C.

Rand Corp. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, R-1589/1-HEW, April 1975.

Sarason, Seymour B. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston; Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1971, p. 105, 103.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A

TITLE I STUDY

SURVEY FORM

Name_____

School_____

Today's Date_____

1. Current grade level or position_____

2. Years at this grade level or position_____

3. Number of years of teaching experience_____

4. Number of years teaching in the { FRELEA Program / LRDC IM } _____

5. Grade levels taught in the { FRELEA Program / LRDC IM } _____

Grade levels	Years at grade
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

6. Number of years as Early Childhood Team Leader _____

7. Educational level (Check all categories that apply to you).

   a. Bachelor's _____

   b. Master's _____

   c. Master's plus _____

   d. Doctoral program _____

   e. Doctorate _____

8. Please provide a phone number through which you can be reached: _____

Attachment B

Title I Early Childhood Program Questionnaire

Name _____ Date _____

School _____

The list to the left of the chart below represents components of the Early Childhood programs (Frelea and LRDC). For each component please look across the page and check the one column which best describes the extent to which it now exists in your classroom.

Please read through all of the choices and always select the one that most accurately reflects your present teaching.

Program Components	Continued to use as I did with Title I support.	Adapted this to my current situation, but do continue to use it.	Chose not to use in my present classroom.	Have tried to use but couldn't.	Would like to use but need more time.	Would like to use but need assistance.	Would like to use but need materials	Does not apply.
I. Classroom management								
a. Methods of dealing with student behavior								
b. Arrangement of physical environment								
c. Scheduling procedures								
II. Curriculum materials								
a. Using teacher designed materials								
b. Using commercially purchased materials								
c. Using Program produced materials								
III. Record keeping								
a. Teacher kept records								
b. Child kept records								
c. Group records (kept by children for group activities)								
IV. Techniques for Individualization								
a. Pre-testing								
b. Post-testing								
c. Diagnosing								
d. Prescribing								
V. Specific teaching methods								
a. Tutoring								
b. Small group work								
c. Creating learning hierarchies								
d. Discovery learning								
e. Peer teaching								

1. The Title I Program provided support for professional growth. The list below represents most of the "facilitators" of professional growth that were provided. Please rank the following five items in order of their value in promoting your professional growth. "1" will indicate the item of the most value; "5" will indicate the item you percieve as being of the least value.

   _____ Summer workshops

   _____ Team Leader support

   _____ FRELEA workshop staff or LRDC consultant staff

   _____ Supervisory Instructional Specialist

   _____ Regularly scheduled all-day workshops

2. What aspect, if any, of your Title I program do you miss the most?

3. What aspect, if any, of your Title I program are you most happy to have had eliminated?

4. Is there anything else on which you would like to comment?

Attachment C

LRDC/PPS Title I Study

Interview

Name of Teacher_____ Interviewer_____

School_____ Date_____

Phone Number of School_____ Time_____

1. If you have adapted the program components in your classroom, what kinds of adaptations have you made?

2. Can you identify factors within your school which support or inhibit the use of the program in your classroom (such as time, attitude of principal, etc.)?

3. How did your experience in the program effect your attitude towards the way children learn?

4. On a scale from 1 to 5 (1 being the most useful to you, 5 being the least useful to you), how would you rank the following items?

a. Summer workshops	1	2	3	4	5
b. Team Leader support	1	2	3	4	5
c. FRELEA Workshop Staff or LRDC Consultant Staff	1	2	3	4	5
d. Supervisory Instructional Specialist	1	2	3	4	5
e. Regularly Scheduled All-Day Workshops	1	2	3	4	5

5. If the program was started again, let's say next year, what type of recommendations would you make to the program?

6. If you had your choice, would you consider teaching in the program again?

If yes, why?

If no, why not?

7. Observation? (Circle response)
   1. Yes
   2. No

The following questions should be filled out by the interviewer immediately following the interview.

1. Was anyone else present in the room (or immediate environment) while you were conducting the interview?
   1. Yes
      If yes, who? _____
   2. No

2. In general, what was the respondent's attitude towards the interview? (Circle as many as appropriate).
   1. Friendly
   2. Eager
   3. Cooperative
   4. Indifferent
   5. Bored
   6. Hostile
   7. Other, specify _____

3. Was respondent's understanding of the questions. . .
   1. Good
   2. Fair
   3. Poor
   4. Other, specify _____

4. Was there sufficient time for the interview?
   1. Yes
   2. No
      If no, why not? _____

5. Location of Interview _____

6. Additional Comments: